DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 065 065 HE 003 198

TITLE	Final Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Status of Women in the Historical Profession.
INSTITUTION	American Historical Association, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Jun 70
NOTE	43p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	College Faculty; *Equal Opportunities (Jobs); *Feminism; *Higher Education; Professors; *Sex Discrimination; *Womens Education; Women Teachers

ABSTRACT

On February 21, 1970, the American Historical Association established an ad hoc committee to study the status of women in the profession. The instructions to the committee were as follows: (1) to commission studies and collect statistics and other information on the numbers, positions, and treatment of women in the historical profession at all levels; (2) to arrange sessions and hold hearings during the 1970 annual convention of the Association, and subsequent conventions as necessary, so as to make public its own and other studies and provide opportunity for other members of the profession to present independent testimony or comment on the studies so presented; (3) to publish and circulate widely the results of its studies and others presented at conventions; (4) to make recommendations for action by the American Historical Association in 1970 and subsequent years on matters affecting the status of women in the profession; and (5) to receive and solicit information relating to specific instances of discrimination. This document presents a report of the findings and recommendations of that committee. (Author/HS)

ED 065065

Final Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Status of Women in the Historical Profession. American Historical Association

Table of Contents

Part One: The Charge to the Committee and Its Interpretation

Part Two: General Summary of Findings

Part Three: A Profile of Recent Ph.D. Recipients on History

Part Four: Resolutions Adopted by the American Historical Association

Appendix A: Survey of Employment Patterns in Thirty Representative Institutions

Appendix B: Questionnaire Addressed to 1970 Ph.D. Recipients

Appendix C: Decennial Check of Women Participants in AHA Programs and on AHA Committees

Appendix D: Principal Sources Consulted

Appendix E: Proportions of Women to Men Receiving Ph.D. and M.A. Degrees between 1900 and 1970

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

HE 00 3197

June 1970

PART ONE: The Committee's Charge and its Interpretation

On February 21st, 1970, the American Historical Association established an *ad hoc* committee to study the status of women in the profession, in response to a petition received on October 20th, 1969, by the Executive Council. The instructions to the committee were as follows:

A. To commission studies and collect statistics and other information on the numbers, positions, and treatment of women in the historical profession at all levels (student admissions, grants, degrees awarded, faculty employment, salary, promotion, etc.):

B. To arrange sessions and hold hearings during the 1970 annual convention of the Association, and subsequent conventions as necessary, so as to make public its own and other studies and provide opportunity for other members of the profession to present independent testimony or comment on the studies so presented;

C. To publish and circulate widely the results of its studies and others presented at conventions;

D. To make recommendations for action by the American Historical Association in 1970 and subsequent years on matters affecting the status of women in the profession;

E. To receive and solicit information relating to specific instances of discrimination.

In addition to these specific instructions the committee was given discretion to evaluate and make recommendations on the original petition of the Coordinating Committee on Women in the Historical Profession, which may be read in its entirety in the June, 1970 *Newsletter* of the Association.

The committee had no difficulty in reaching agreement in the interpretation of its instructions, and on according the highest priority to instructions under charge D, "To make recommendations for action by the American Historical Association in 1970 and subsequent years on matters affecting the status of women in the profession."

Although it has been tempting to us as historians to study the historical background of the present standing of professional women, we concluded early in our deliberations that the urgency of the problems women face in the historical profession today precluded the leisurely approach that the thorough investigation of the historical dimension would have required. A blanket survey of our membership at all ranks and ages would have taken more than a year to administer and analyze, and the committee decided that on balance the information so secured would not justify the delay involved. We therefore agreed that we should concentrate initially upon several limited investigations aimed directly at areas of pressure where action of the AHA might bring about an improvement within a reasonable length of time.

Therefore, in response to the thrust of those instructions pertaining to investigation, (A, B. and C of the committee's charge) we have focused on the following tasks:

1) We supervised a survey of employment patterns in thirty representative institutions, the results of which are described in the summary of findings which follows this section of our report, and in Appendix A.
2) Recognizing that women may feel the current constriction in the job market more acutely than men will, we have composed a questionnaire to be submitted to all Ph.D. recipients of

1970, designed to discover what kinds of employment men and women are offered, why they have taken the jobs they have taken, and how many men and women have not as yet found suitable employment, and if possible, why they have not. (See Appendix B)

3) We counted the numbers of women participating in the programs of the annual AHA meetings for one meeting each decade, and counted the numbers of women members on the Association's committees for one year of each decade. (See Appendix C)

4) We planned two sessions for the 1970 meeting of the AHA, the first to explore "Women's Experience in History: A Teaching Problem," and the second to present a draft report of this committee for the open discussion of interested members of the Association.

The committee has also explored the considerable literature on the status of women that has accumulated in the form of institutional reports, governmental statistics and reports, and private scholarship. Some of the more important studies and reports are listed in Appendix D. These studies, combined with our own investigations, leave us no doubt that prompt action on the part of the AHA is required.

The committee has placed an initial priority on developing a general picture of the standing of women in the profession rather than on assembling information as to individual cases of alleged discrimination. It did not wish to raise expectations of remedy which could not be fulfilled when there are as yet no procedures for dealing with individual cases. In fact, no issue before us has pointed out more sharply the

conflict between the Association's legitimate interest in equitable professional practices and the inappropriateness of its attempting to adjudicate cases of alleged discrimination against individual members, than has the problem raised for the committee under its charge "to receive and solicit information relating to specific instances of discrimination." Neither the AHA nor this committee, which is its creation, can perform judicial functions, and the powers of the committee to investigate are necessarily limited. The committee could, however, point out areas of most pressing concern, and the AHA can serve to maintain a continuing awareness of the special problems women face in our profession. The committee hopes, further, that the recently re-activated Committee on the Status of Women in the AAUP will develop viable means of legal redress. The committee recommends and expects that the AHA will work actively with other professional associations in forwarding the work of the AAUP toward that end. Beyond that, this committee has recommended that the executive secretary of the proposed Committee on Women Historians be able to provide full and authoritative information to any member who seeks it, as to the legal recourses women now have at their disposal.

For reasons already given, the committee has not formally solicited information on specific cases. (See Charge E) It has, however, received in the regular course of its correspondence, a number of letters bearing on particular cases. Over the last eight months some twenty letters to the chairman have revealed alleged instances of discrimination against women in pay, instances of failure to promote to tenure, when tenure seemed indicated, termination of contract with little or no notice, and many cases of women unable to find employment commensurate

with their training. A number of these letters came from professional men who perceived an injustice being done to a woman colleague. Visits to several institutions in various parts of the country, and conversations with students and faculty in a wide range of institutions have convinced us that the problems appearing in our letters are general.

PART TWO: General Summary of Findings

The proportion of women receiving doctorates in all fields has never been high, but it has been lower in the 1950's and 1960's than it was in 1920, 1930, or 1940. Most recent figures show about eleven percent of doctorates going to women, down from the earlier high of sixteen percent in the twenties and thirties. The percents in history run a little higher than the overall figures. Our questionnaire (see Appendix B) reveals that in 1969-70, above 13% of all the Ph.D.'s in history were women. During the last ten years the ten leading graduate departments of history (based on the 1966 American Council on Education evaluation) have been granting about fifteen percent of their Ph.D.'s to women. The proportion of women receiving M.A.'s in history from these universities is nearly double those receiving Ph.D.'s.

Although women receive Ph.D.'s in history from leading graduate departments, they are not appointed to these faculties in significant numbers. (See Appendix A) These departments employed between 98 and 99 percent men on their faculties, the women serving primarily in the lower ranks. Five of these leading ten departments appointed no woman to any of the three professorial ranks. In the first three of these years none of the departments had a woman full professor, and only three

of the ten departments had a woman full professor at any time during this period. Women constitute about ten percent of the history department members of ten excellent coeducational liberal arts colleges. For the graduate departments the figure is less than two percent. Most startling, however, is the progressive deterioration in the status of women in the departments of coeducational colleges. In 1959-60 sixteen percent of the full professors were women, but in 1968-69 only one woman full professor remained, and she retired the following year. The decline is undoubtedly largely attributable to the retirement of the generation of women historians trained in the twenties and thirties combined with the tendency to hire men in the post-war years. A decline is also noticeable in the proportion of women associate professors; only among the assistant professors is any increase perceptible. Seven of the ten women's colleges surveyed follow the pattern customarily associated with them of having had a high proportion of women in their history faculties during the first half of the century followed by a decline in the last decade.

One factor militating against the advancement of women Ph.D.'s is the widely-held assumption that women prefer to marry and devote themselves to domestic life. This assumption is belied by the evidence offered by Helen S. Astin in The Woman Doctorate in America. She shows that 91 percent of the women receiving doctorates in all fields in the mid-fifties were employed in some type of work seven years later. Moreover, married women Ph.D.'s who are employed full-time show a higher publication rate than either unmarried women Ph.D.'s or men Ph.D.'s, according to the studies of Rita Simon, Shirley Merritt Clark, and Kathleen

Galway. The discrepancy between women's professional status and performance is thus not grounded in any lack of commitment to the life of learning. Lawrence Simpson's ingenious investigations have thrown new light on the problem. He has shown that those who practice discrimination against women in academic employment also hold general views concerning female inferiority. Prejudiced attitudes are strongest among men who have been in teaching and/or administration for a period of from five to twenty years. This age group may be assumed to constitute the majority of decision makers in almost any department. The least prejudiced attitudes toward women are found in those under 30 and over 60 years of age. In history as in other academic areas, our sample of thirty institutions indicates women are employed primarily in non-tenured ranks. Moreover, far from abandoning their professions for pure domesticity, their very eagerness to work has made women vulnerable to exploitation. Their readiness -- and sometimes their need -- to accept irregular and part-time positions has led to their exclusion from participation in the main stream of academic rewards and preferment. Opening regular career lines to partially employed women emerges from our findings as an urgent need. Faculties and students stand to benefit no less than the women whose services are presently not adequately utilized and recognized. (See Part Four, Resolutions, III, 4 (b)).

Finally, the Association should take note of the fact that it has no better record than the colleges and universities we have surveyed in engaging the participation of women in its central activities. (See Resolutions, III, 3, and Appendix C)

PART THREE: A Profile of Recent Ph.D. Recipients in History

The Questionnaire:

Because many of the questions we were attempting to answer proved intractible to other approaches, the Committee on the Status of Women decided to conduct a limited survey of our very recent Ph.D.'s in history, with the object of gaining some statistical information on a number of topics that appeared to us to be of critical importance. We hoped to discover how career patterns of the women graduate students differed from those of the men, whether the women were handicapped in the constricting job market in ways amenable to improvement by the efforts of this Association, and what impressions the graduate school experience had left upon our new Ph.D.'s, whether men or women, with regard to possible sex prejudice in such significant areas as admissions, fellowship support, and job placement. Upon the theory that the first job may well be of crucial significance in a beginning teacher's future prospects as a publishing scholar, we were especially interested in discovering exactly what kind of jobs the women were getting upon their departure from graduate school.

In December of 1970 the committee circulated a questionnaire to Ph.D. recipients of 1969-70. We enlisted the aid of department chairmen in getting the addresses of the Ph.D.'s, and ended with a list of 443 persons, to whom questionnaires were mailed. With the aid of one follow-up letter, we had the exceptionally high response of more than 75%. The National Academy of Sciences lists 1092 Ph.D.'s in history for fiscal 1970, and so it will be seen that the Committee has heard from more than a third of the Ph.D.'s of the year 1969-70. We heard from 69 women (out

of a probable 145 total for the year) and from 286 men (out of a probable 947 for the year). This means that the rate of response was somewhat higher among the women than the men, but the total response was in any case encouraging.

Age and Length of Time in Graduate School:

From figures obtained from the National Academy of Sciences it appears that women constitute 13.3% of the new history Ph.D.'s, a figure in line with other recent investigations. These women Ph.D.'s tend to be several years older than their male counterparts, because 74% of the women were born by the year 1940 (and are now over thirty), but only 65% of the men were born before that year. Put another way, the women we questioned were, on the average, 35 years old upon receiving the Ph.D., while the men were on the average just above 32 years of age. The discrepancy is not a reflection of excessive tardiness on the part of the women in finishing their degrees, however, because the figures indicate that later entry into graduate work accounts for the larger part of the age gap upon graduation. From the commencement of graduate study to the Ph.D., the women have required 9.1 years, while the men have required 8.56 years, leaving a difference of approximately 6 months. A comparison with the results of the Perkins-Snell report of 1962 suggests that the Ph.D. in history takes longer now than it did eight years ago, in spite of many efforts to expedite graduate training. Certainly the sex difference between the length of time required by men and women for the degree is not very large, and is more than accounted for by the fact that women reported a higher frequency of breaks in the course of study than did the men. More than 67% of the women report having interrupted their graduate work, while only 53% of the men have done so.

Why Studies are Interrupted:

Of the 45 women who reported having an interruption in study, ten women listed "need to support family" and "need to assist spouse to complete graduate work" as major reasons. Only six listed "family and/or children requiring attention at home" as a major cause of interruption, although 7 others listed it as a minor cause. Nine of the women listed "Desire to secure teaching experience before the degree" as a major cause of interruption. Only four of the forty-five women listed "childbirth" as a major cause, and nobody listed "illness," although with the women as with the men, there was in over 50% of the cases of interruption some "other" reason that was regarded as "major" but not included on the questionnaire. [See question 19 on page 3 of Appendix B]. These other reasons could have ranged from a move from the community where study was in progress (in the case of married women) to academic reasons, or a host of specific and personal causes that would differ with each individual. For men military service undoubtedly accounted for much lost time. It may be safely assumed that many of these reasons for interruption have prevented some women from finishing graduate work.

The diversity of reasons for interruption of women's gradute study contrasts with the prominence of a single paramount reason for men. Remembering that only just above half of the men experienced an interruption in study, it becomes clear that the majority of these (65%) listed "Need to secure teaching experience" as a "major cause" of interruption. None of the men stopped "to assist spouse complete graduate study," although 5% listed this as a minor cause.

That women who are employed in the course of their graduate study go to jobs of less prestige (and possibly less pay as well) than do the men, is strongly indicated by a comparison of the responses to two questions concerning previous employment. [See questions 32 and 33 on page 6 of the questionnaire]. On the assumption that neither men nor women receive employment at the college level of teaching before beginning graduate study, it is worth noting that upon completion of the degree only 43 per cent of the previously employed women have been engaged at the college level, whereas more than 70 per cent of the men have been teaching in colleges. Lack of mobility undoubtedly accounts for a considerable part of this discrepancy, but surely not all. There is some evidence that the men who are employed before the degree is completed are more often engaged in teaching undergraduates at the degree-granting institution, either as a part of their support program (the Danforth Teaching Fellowships, for instance), or for replacement of regular faculty, than are the women. The previous employment period listed for men most often was 1 year, whereas for women it was 2 years. Considering this interim employment pattern, the women would appear to have done well to achieve the Ph.D. within six months of their male cohorts.

Marriage and Children

Of the women in one study 22% had remained single, and an additional 6% were members of a religious order, while only 15% of the men had remained single. More of the women remained childless than had their male classmates.

A comparison of the percentages of men and women who are, or who have been at some time, married before completion of degree, with the

percentages who have one or more children in each group, reveals that the married men are more likely to have become parents before the degree is completed than are the married women, but the difference is not very great. Among the men who are not single or in a religious order 73% are the parents of one or more children upon graduation, as compared with 64 percent of the women. It is impossible to determine with precision exactly how much time was lost by men or women in pursuit of the degree, owing to parenthood, and therefore it would be unjustifiable to posit that the women who have received the Ph.D. on time in our sample were more highly motivated or more able than the men, on the basis of figures given above. On the other hand there is no evidence to support the idea that women are any less able as students than are their men cohorts, or any slower in achieving their goal. Nor is it correct to say that being married or having children has seriously handicapped women who have actually completed their degrees.

Political and Social Characteristics

There are many similarities in the two groups, and at least one interesting contrast. Of the group the committee studied, it was discovered that the women were more evenly distributed among the three major religious affiliations than were the men. When asked for the religion they were reared in, the following relationships appeared:

	Protestant	Catholic	Jewish
Men	60%	20%	12%
Women	39%	30%	21%

In political preferences there was a remarkable similarity between the two groups. Although no woman listed herself as being "very conservative" or "far left," the percentages in the other groupings were

very close. Among the men nearly 7% regarded themselves as "conservative" and "very conservative," while 5½% of the women regarded themselves as being simply "conservative," and by far the larger protion of each group (94% of the women and 88% of the men) fell into the categories of "moderate," "liberal," and "left."

Financial Support and the Admissions Question:

Our results revealed no great disparity between men and women in their respective analyses of their means of financial support during graduate school. If anything, it appears from our results that more of the women have regarded their fellowships as a major source of income than have the men. Men have been more willing (or more able, or under greater necessity) to borrow money to continue study than have the women, and an appreciably larger percentage of the men have listed personal savings as being especially important. Thirty-seven percent of the men thought of the support received from their wives as being a "major" source of support, while only 25% of the women counted the husband's income as "major." The fact that the women were less often married would serve to diminish the significance of this difference. Half of the men, on the other hand, thought of their teaching and resident assistantships as being a major source of support, and only 38% of the women listed that source as being "major." On the whole, except for the instances when the working wife assisted her husband, the similarities of response to these questions [see question 20 on page 4 of questionnaire] are more remarkable than the divergences. It must be

remembered, however, that an unknown number of each sex have probably been unable to finish their work for financial reasons. Whether women constitute a disproportionate number of those who are lost along the way for lack of support is impossible to determine from this questionnaire. The relationship of admissions to graduate study and fellowship support is critical to a consideration of this question, and determining whether sex prejudice plays an important role in the initial consideration of women as prospective graduate students proved to be the most elusive question we faced.

A major reason for the difficulty posed by admissions policies is that universities have widely differing ways of counting applications to graduate departments, and the chairman of this committee was informed by Dr. John Chase of the Office of Education that no reliable statistics exist. Some universities report every application, whether completed or not, others only those completed, others only those acted upon by the graduate departments.

Perceived Sex Discrimination in Moderate School:

The failure to discover how many women as compared with men have made an initial effort to gain entry to graduate school obviously affects seriously any assessment of the fairness of operative admissions policies. The students who gained admission and completed their studies are clearly not in the best position to assess the difficulties encountered by those whom they never met at graduate school, or even the important reasons for the disappearance of fellow students of either sex who are unable to finish their studies. Nevertheless, in anticipation of receiving some incidental light on these questions, a question concerning perceived prejudice in graduate school was included in the questionnaire [see question 34 on page 7 of Appendix B].

The results are summarized in percentages of the total response by sex in the following table:

Perceived Discrimination in Graduate Departments (in percentages)

Discrimination	Strong	Some	Neutral	Some Favor.	Strong Favor.
Admissions					
Men	1.6	16.5	69.8	8.6	3.3
Women	4.4	30.8	55.9	5.9	2.9
Fellowship					
Men	3.7	18.4	67.0	7.1	3.7
Women	8.8	33.8	48.5	5.8	2.9
Support from Teaching Job					
Men	1.7	14.5	75.0	6.8	2.1
Women	8.8	25.0	57.0	5.8	2.9
Job Placement Aid					
Men	I.2	12.7	76.6	7.2	2.1
Women	13.6	15.1	62.1	4.5	4.5
Securing Faculty Sponsor for Dissertation					
Men	1.2	7.0	82.3	7.4	2.0
Women	1.5	3.0	79.0	7.5	9.0
Faculty Contact					
Men	1.2	13.7	72.5	9.7	2.8
Women	9.0	18.0	56.0	10.0	6.0
Student Contact					
Men	0.4	7.7	73.0	15.0	4.0
Women	1.5	18.0	61.0	12.0	7.5
Other					
Men	4.1	6.3	81.0	6.2	2.0
Women	33.0	8.0	41.7	-	16.0

LITHOGRAPHED IN U.S.A. - ADDISON WESLEY PUBLISHING COMPANY, INC., READING, MASS.

Perhaps the most striking result registered on the table is that with 2 exceptions, the majority of the Ph.D.'s of both sexes believed that their departments have been "neutral" with regard to sex in dealing with graduate students. It is just as clearly evident that the women did not register their departments as being quite so "neutral" as the men did, although in several categories a number of the women thought of themselves as having been "strongly favored." This response is especially noteworthy in the case of the search for a sponsor of the dissertation, and in the general area of student and faculty contacts. It is also registered here that a goodly proportion of both sexes saw in their departments a tendency to discriminate "somewhat" in dealing with women graduate students, and there is a strong suggestion that the women students felt that the same thing might be said of male students.

In their observation of admissions policy the women tended to perceive discrimination in admissions at approximately twice the rate men did, and approximately 35% of them felt that this discriminatory attitude was descriptive of their graduate institution. The close tie between admissions and fellowships is revealed in the responses registered by each sex to the first two categories listed. Each sex registered the highest perception of discrimination in these areas. Not quite half of the women regarded their institutions as being completely "neutral" in the awarding of fellowship support, and a smaller majority of the men (67%) believed their institutions were "neutral" in this respect than in any other.

Conclusions based on such a special group as this one (that is, those who have succeeded) must remain tentative. These results do suggest, however, that for strong students among the women, gaining ad-

missions to graduate school, especially with fellowship support, constitutes a larger problem than remaining there once admitted, whether the women marry, have children, or encounter problems of mobility in the course of study. There is one factor in our sample that may have a small effect in dampening the response of females with regard to discrimination in financial aid, especially when compared with male responses to the same question. Approximately one-third of the women received their degree from the ten top-ranking departments in the country, departments that may be assumed to be more affluent (and hence better able to support all strong students), whereas only one-fourth of the men have received their degrees from these same departments.

The First Job:

The suspicion that women do not on the average find first jobs that provide as much time and opportunity for research and publication as men do, was an important reason for our decision to question the recent Ph.D.'s about this particular point. The facts revealed in the questionnaire demonstrated that our suspicions were not without foundation. Among the Ph.D.'s of last year the unemployment rate for women was not so great as we had feared, for the women were 92% employed, and the men are 96.8% employed. An examination of the kind of employment women have received, however, and their reasons for accepting these jobs, shows that the first job poses a greater problem for women than for men, and that it constitutes one of the most acute pressure points in the career development of women historians. Unlike admissions, this subject lends itself readily to objective investigation and analysis based on our recent Ph.D. group. The problems posed by the failure of women to secure their share of the good first jobs remain, however, among the most difficult of all for our Committee and for the Association.

The women who presented themselves for employment last year may be assumed to be at least as well prepared as their male cohorts, since a higher proportion of them have come from the more prestigious departments. Unless the pattern established earlier and reported by this Committee as a result of its investigation of the proportions and rank of women in these same top-ranking departments has changed radically in the last two years, it is unlikely that more than two or three of the women Ph.D.'s of 1970 found employment in one of these top ten departments of the country. [See Appendix A]. The percentage of women who are employed in "private universities," as reported in response to our questionnaire, is encouraging. The following table shows the distribution of the recent graduates who are employed in teaching or academic administration:

Employer (in percentages)

	Men	Women
2-year colleges	2	9
4 year colleges, coed	31	22
4 year colleges, men's	1.5	1.6
Private universities	11	16
State Universities	43	28
Other	7	13

Although only 44% of the women as opposed to 54% of the men are engaged in universities, public and private, and in spite of the much higher percentage of women teaching in two-year colleges, the distribution is undoubtedly more equitable than it has been in recent years, and it offers grounds for hope of continued improvement.

Other aspects of the employment picture are by no means encouraging. While only 5% of the men employed have been engaged at the rank of Visiting Lecturer, Lecturer, and Instructor, these lower categories embrace the ranks at which 32% of the women were engaged. Assistant Professor is the usual assignment of rank to the beginning Ph.D., and 77% of all the men have been assigned this rank, whereas only 47% of the women were engaged at that level.

Even more disheartening are the comparative figures on salaries. The median salary for the recent Ph.D.'s falls between $10,000 and $12,000, and 66% of the men were earning salaries between these figures last year. Only 35% of the women were in the same salary bracket. Only 16% of all the men were earning less than $10,000, but over half the women (51%) earned under $10,000.

Why this sex differential in rank and pay occurs, is of particular significance to efforts that may be made to equalize opportunities for women. Fifty-four % of the employed men had received more than one offer of a job, whereas only 26% of the employed women had had any range of choice, although two of the 65 women responding to this question had received more than 3 offers. Nineteen (or 7%) of the 271 men responding to the same question had received more than 3 offers. Approximately 57% of the women were employed at the only place they had been offered employment. For whatever reasons, it is clear that women do not have the range of choice in employment that the average man may expect even in the present employment crisis.

How much of this differential in opportunity is attributable to failure of institutional aids to assist women is a debatable point.

Fifty-five % of the men employed attributed their placement to the aid of their dissertation supervisors, or the departmental or university placement services, while only 37% of the women credited landing their jobs to such aid. Whether this difference is owing to institutional favoritism to men, indifference, or to the inability of women for personal reasons to take advantage of these services may only be guessed. It is plain, in any case, that institutional aids are not as useful for women in job placement as they are for men.

Some hypotheses are available for consideration on this point, however, arising from the comparison of responses of the employed Ph.D.'s when they were asked to weigh the reasons they had accepted their jobs. When asked (see question 29 of Appendix B) to rank in importance their reasons for accepting their present employment, over half of the women listed each of these three reasons as being "very important" considerations: 1) job scarcity; 2) location; and 3) failure of spouse to be re-located elsewhere. Although no man attributed much significance to the third factor, they too ranked job scarcity and location as being "very important" more often than any other considerations (at 36% and 43% respectively). The pre-eminence of these reasons among the others offered (notably salary, prestige of institution, promotion prospects, library facilities) was not nearly so marked among the employed men as it was in the case of employed women. A wider range of considerations is apparent in the men's choice of jobs, reflecting in all probability, their greater mobility in the job market.

In comparing men and women in their assessments of what was "<u>not</u> important" in their decision to take their present jobs, we found that women regarded salary as being "not important" to their decision twice

as often as men did. Nearly 70% of the women (as opposed to 44% of the men) regarded library facilities as being "not important" to their decision. Half of the women regarded both hope of future promotion and the prestige of the institution as being "not important" to their decision. For women, the constraint posed by their lack of mobility was clearly the paramount factor in their decision. Aside from the contemporary pressures that have caused all job-seekers to consider job scarcity, the men have been affected by the entire range of usual considerations in their acceptance of their jobs.

All of the present unemployed women apparently expect to take jobs within a few years, 60% of them "as soon as possible," and the others "within a year" or "in a few years." Three are now unemployed because no offer was made to them, and two because the offer was "unsuitable." Two others were out of the work force because of family responsibilities, and one for reasons of health.

Conclusions:

From our survey of the 1969-70 Ph.D.'s much more information may be gleaned than has been set forth in this brief sketch of the results. The Committee hopes that the Standing Committee on the Status of Women will mine the questionnaire for a more complete picture of the recent Ph.D.'s.

Some conclusions may be reached from even so hasty a resume, however, and though they must remain tentative for the moment, they do suggest that women are at considerable disadvantage in professional history on account of sex. Those who have finished their degrees appear to have done so

within the same length of time that men have taken, and they have done so in spite of more numerous and longer breaks in their graduate education. For these women students, who may be assumed to be exceptionally strong, the problem of fellowship support does not appear to have been a major cause of complaint. It is impossible to determine how many women have been unable to attend graduate school because of discriminatory admissions and fellowship policies, nor can one learn from our questionnaire how many women have been unable to continue their studies because of financial or personal difficulties.

The most outstanding problem registered in our results is the difficulty of placing women well in their first job. For them the inability to gain the advantage of mobility in the market was clearly very important, although the factor of prejudice against them as prospective employees surely played a role in their lower status and pay from the very outset of their careers as historian teacher-scholars.

All in all, the Committee feels that the resolutions passed at the last meeting of this Association in Boston were not amiss, and that women historians have much to gain from their implementation at all levels. This action is reported in Part Four of this report, which follows.

PART FOUR: Recommended Resolutions Adopted by the American Historical Association

The present demand for social justice for women coincides with the permanent interest of the historical profession. To increase the opportunities open to women in the field of history is to advance the quality of the profession itself. Both objectives dictate the necessity of vigorous steps to remove existing disabilities and to establish a genuine parity for women historians. The American Historical Association has a responsibility for developing professional criteria and administrative practices that will contribute to the achievement of these ends. Accordingly the Committee proposed that the Association adopt the following basic positions, policies, and institutional measures at its Business Meeting in Boston, on December 28, 1970:

1 Positions

1) The American Historical Association expresses its formal disapproval of discrimination against women in graduate school admissions, grants, awarding of degrees; and in faculty recruitment, salary, promotions and conditions of employment.
2) The American Historical Association pledges itself to work actively toward enlarging the numbers of women in the profession by enhancing the opportunities available to them, acting both through its own resources as an organization and through the cooperation which departments of history may be expected to give it.

24

II Policies

The American Historical Association commits itself to the following policies in four areas which it regards as crucial to significant progress in the foreseeable future:

1) Continuing surveillance of institutional policy and practice in the training, recruitment, and academic promotion of qualified women.
2) Assistance to individual women in the development of their scholarly and teaching careers.
3) Involvement of greater numbers of women in the formal activities of the Association.
4) Development of means for rectifying grievances resulting from discriminating practices.

III Institutional measures

Recognizing that responsibility for activity in each of the above areas must be shared by historians organized in departments and acting as individuals, the Association will provide initiative and assistance through the following practical measures:

1) The American Historical Association will establish a standing Committee on Women Historians to develop the sustained attention and pressure indispensable to an advance in the status of women. This Committee should consist of eight members representing as broad a range of institutions as possible. It should be composed of historians at different stages of their professional development, including graduate students. The Committee will have a paid executive secretary responsible for

25

coordinating and administering on a day-to-day basis the functions with which the committee is charged. The duties of the committee will include the following:

a) To maintain and make public no less than once a year information on the numbers and progress of women students in graduate school, the proportions and rank of those employed, and a current picture of the standing of women in the historical profession.

b) To publish information on departments or institutions whose methods of enlarging the role of women in the profession may serve as models for other institutions.

c) To develop and maintain a file of women historians that will provide information on available personnel to interested departments and to the AHA.

d) To gather and make available the fullest information concerning the recourses open to women who face problems of discrimination or other difficulties in employment and to provide individual consultation and advice on such matters

2) The American Historical Association will act together with committees on the status of women and on academic freedom that exist in other professional organizations to develop effective mechanisms for dealing with individual cases of alleged discrimination against women. The Association will also support actively any positive steps in this direction

undertaken by the AAUP's recently reactivated committee established for this purpose.

3) The American Historical Association will secure greater representation of women on the programs of its meetings, on its standing committees, and on the Executive Council.

4) The American Historical Association will seek to enlist the active collaboration of departments of history in:

   a) Working for the elimination of nepotism rules, written or unwritten.

   b) Developing a greater flexibility with regard to part-time employment (for men and women who desire it.) The Association urges that part-time positions carry full academic status, equal consideration for promotion, and proportionate compensation and benefit at all levels, including the tenured ranks. (A faculty member, whether a man or a woman, should be granted a reduced workload with reduced pay at his or her request in order to care for infants.)

   c) Encouraging a greater flexibility in the administration of graduate degree requirements by adapting these to the needs and capacities of individual students. The Association encourages graduate departments to work for greater flexibility in permitting the transfer of graduate course work from one institution to another.

   d) Encouraging the adoption of a policy of maternity leaves for women graduate students and women faculty. For graduate students, the period of leave (whether it takes the form of full-time leave, reduced work load, or extension of the schedule within which requirements have to be fulfilled) should not be counted against the total time allowed for completion of the degree. For faculty women, pregnancy should not be counted against the number of years that precede consideration for promotion.

The phrases above enclosed in parentheses were amendments proposed and passed at the business meeting. A more fundamental change in our report as offered was a substitution of our section 4 d with the following resolution:

"Women ~~Pregnancy~~ should not be penalized for pregnancy and maternity. Therefore:

1) Pregnancy should not be grounds for dismissal, downgrading, holding up promotion, or withholding of the granting of tenure. For graduate students, maternity leave should not be counted against the maximum number of years allowd for completion of the degree.

2) No woman should be forced to take a leave due to preganancy but all women should be entitled to short-term confinement leave. Such leave should be treated with regard to pay in the same manner as temporary absence for medical reasons.

3) After childbirth, a woman should be entitled to additional leave up to a year, at her request. Such additional leave should be treated in regard to pay, promotion and the granting of tenure in the same manner as leaves for military service for male academics.

This substitution was carried by voice vote, and the resolutions, as amended, were passed by the action of the business meeting.

Appendix A

The following tables show the number of women and the number of men in each of the professorial ranks in thirty departments of history. In each case the number of women in a given rank is shown first and then the number of men so that the entry 2/6 indicates two women and six men in that rank. The graduate departments of history are selected on the basis of the American Council on Education 1966 evaluation of graduate departments. The coeducational liberal arts colleges and the women's colleges are ones generally regarded as having good academic reputations. In the coeducational and the women's colleges some attention was also given to geographic distribution. For the women's colleges staffing information was also sought for the decade years of this century in order to illustrate the changing position of women faculty in those institutions.

The information which these tables show was gleaned from the published catalogues of the various institutions and from the replies from the department chairmen of the thirty institutions who received the preliminary reports based on the survey of the catalogues. In August, 1970, a letter was sent to the departments taken from the published catalogues. A reply was requested by October 15, 1970, and the letter stated that if no reply was received, it would be assumed that the original catalogue information was correct. Replies were received from nineteen of the thirty institutions. We have not counted visiting faculty members when we have been able to identify them as visitors.

GRADUATE DEPARTMENTS OF HISTORY

Appendix A

	1959/60			1960/61			1961/62			1962/63			1963/64		
	Prof. ↘	Assoc. Prof.	Ass't. Prof.	Prof. ↘	Assoc. Prof.	Ass't. Prof.	Prof. ↘	Assoc. Prof.	Ass't. Prof.	Prof. ↘	Assoc. Prof.	Ass't. Prof.	Prof. ↘	Assoc. Prof.	Ass't. Prof.
U. of California (Berkeley)	0/17	1/15	0/9	0/20	1/11	0/8	0/21	1/9	0/10	1/24	0/7	0/13	1/27	0/6	0/16
U. of Chicago	0/15	0/8	1/7	0/15	1/8	1/7	0/13	0/9	2/8	0/15	0/11	1/7	0/16	0/11	1/7
Columbia	0/30	0/13	0/2	0/31	0/12	0/2	0/31	0/13	0/4	0/36	0/10	0/6	0/36	0/10	0/6
Cornell	0/8	0/3	0/1	0/7	0/3	0/3	0/7	0/3	0/3	0/9	0/3	0/3	0/11	0/1	0/3
Harvard	0/23	0/5	1/7	0/25	0/3	0/9	0/23	0/2	0/5	0/24	0/3	0/10	0/26	0/2	0/7
U. of Michigan	0/12	0/8	0/5	0/14	0/7	0/6	0/19	0/6	0/6	1/15	0/7	0/5	1/18	0/7	0/8
Princeton	0/13	0/6	0/7	0/15	0/7	0/4	0/13	0/7	0/5	0/14	0/7	0/7	0/17	0/5	0/7
Stanford	0/11	0/5	0/2	0/11	0/6	0/2	0/13	0/6	0/1	0/16	0/7	0/3	0/15	0/6	0/0
U. of Wisconsin	0/14	0/8	0/0	0/17	0/6	0/2	0/17	0/7	0/2	0/17	0/8	0/2	0/22	0/6	0/7
Yale	0/17	1/7	0/6	0/17	1/7	0/5	0/17	1/9	0/4	0/18	1/10	0/5	0/16	1/9	0/6

	1964/65			1965/66			1966/67			1967/68			1968/69		
U. of California (Berkeley)	1/26	0/7	0/16	0/25	0/5	0/22	0/28	0/8	0/25	0/34	0/13	0/20	0/33	0/18	0/18
U. of Chicago	0/16	1/10	0/14	0/19	1/11	0/15	0/22	1/8	0/19	0/21	1/11	0/22	0/23	1/11	0/22
Columbia	0/36	0/11	0/5	0/38	0/15	/7	0/43	1/13	1/10	0/42	1/16	0/8	0/47	1/13	1/10
Cornell	0/11	0/2	0/2	0/12	0/2	0/1	0/15	0/1	0/5	0/15	0/3	0/5	0/16	0/3	0/4
Harvard	0/20	0/2	0/11	0/21	0/3	0/7	0/26	0/2	0/7	0/25	0/1	0/8	0/29	0/0	0/7
U. of Michigan	1/20	0/6	0/12	1/21	0/6	0/12	1/20	0/8	1/14	1/22	0/9	1/12	1/19	0/13	1/10
Princeton	0/19	0/2	0/6	0/23	0/3	0/9	0/21	0/6	0/9	0/23	0/5	0/8	0/21	0/5	0/12
Stanford	0/17	0/4	0/4	0/16	0/2	0/5	0/14	0/3	0/8	0/15	0/3	0/12	0/16	0/6	0/10
U. of Wisconsin	0/25	0/6	0/8	0/29	0/6	0/15	0/29	0/6	0/15	0/30	0/8	0/14	0/32	0/10	0/15
Yale	1/27	0/12	0/13	1/26	0/11	0/14	1/25	0/11	0/19	1/33	0/9	0/22	1/36	0/11	1/24

Key: # women faculty members / # men faculty members

DEPARTMENTS OF HISTORY IN COEDUCATIONAL LIBERAL ARTS COLLEGES — Appendix A

	1959/60			1960/61			1961/62			1962/63			1963/64		
	Prof.	Assoc. Prof.	Ass't. Prof.	Prof.	Assoc. Prof.	Ass't. Prof.	Prof.	Assoc. Prof.	Ass't. Prof.	Prof.	Assoc. Prof.	Ass't. Prof.	Prof.	Assoc. Prof.	Ass't. Prof.
Carleton	2/1	0/2	0/0	1/1	1/2	0/0	1/1	0/2	0/1	1/1	0/1	0/2	1/1	0/1	0/2
Colby	0/0	0/2	0/2	0/0	0/2	0/2	0/0	0/2	0/1	0/0	0/2	0/2	0/0	0/2	0/2
Macalester	0/4	0/0	0/1	0/4	0/0	0/1	0/3	0/1	0/0	0/3	0/1	0/0	0/3	0/1	0/1
Middlebury	0/1	0/2	0/2	0/1	0/2	0/3	0/1	0/2	0/3	0/1	0/2	0/3	0/2	0/2	0/1
Oberlin	0/3	0/1	0/2	0/2	0/1	0/2	0/2	0/1	0/1	0/2	0/1	0/4	0/2	0/1	0/3
Occidental	0/2	0/3	0/0	0/2	0/3	0/0	0/2	0/3	0/0	0/3	0/1	0/1	0/3	0/2	0/2
Pomona	0/3	1/2	0/1	0/3	1/2	0/1	0/3	1/2	0/0	0/3	1/2	0/0	0/3	1/2	0/1
Reed	1/2	0/3	0/1	1/3	0/2	0/3	1/3	0/2	0/3	1/2	0/3	0/1	1/4	0/1	0/1
Swarthmore	1/4	0/0	0/1	1/4	0/0	0/1	1/4	0/0	0/1	1/4	0/0	0/3	0/4	0/1	0/2
William & Mary	0/1	0/3	0/2	0/1	0/3	0/3	0/2	0/3	0/3	0/2	0/2	0/3	0/3	0/1	0/4

	1964/65			1965/66			1966/67			1967/68			1968/69		
Carleton	1/1	0/1	0/1	1/1	1/2	0/1	0/1	0/2	0/2	0/1	0/2	0/4	0/2	0/2	1/5
Colby	0/1	0/1	0/2	0/1	0/1	0/2	0/1	0/2	0/2	0/2	0/2	0/1	0/2	0/2	1/1
Macalester	0/3	0/1	0/2	0/2	0/1	0/2	0/2	0/1	0/2	0/4	0/2	0/1	0/4	0/2	0/1
Middlebury	0/2	0/1	0/1	0/1	0/1	1/2	0/1	0/1	1/2	0/1	0/1	1/2	0/3	0/2	1/1
Oberlin	0/2	0/1	0/4	0/2	0/1	1/4	0/2	0/3	1/4	0/2	0/3	1/3	0/4	0/1	1/3
Occidental	0/4	0/1	0/2	0/4	0/2	2/1	0/4	0/2	0/2	0/3	0/2	0/2	0/3	0/2	0/2
Pomona	1/2	0/2	0/1	1/3	0/1	0/1	0/3	0/1	0/1	0/4	0/0	0/2	0/4	0/0	0/2
Reed	1/4	0/1	0/3	1/4	0/1	0/4	1/4	0/2	0/2	1/4	0/3	0/1	1/4	0/3	0/2
Swarthmore	0/4	0/1	0/2	0/4	0/2	1/1	0/4	0/2	1/2	0/4	0/1	0/4	0/5	0/0	0/5
William & Mary	0/3	0/2	0/4	0/5	0/2	0/6	0/4	0/4	0/10	0/5	0/6	0/10	0/5	0/6	0/8

Key: # women faculty members / # men faculty members

Appendix B

SURVEY OF 1969-1970 HISTORY DOCTORAL RECIPIENTS

Id. _____

Personal History

1. Name _____
(Last) (First) (Middle or Maiden)

2. Address _____
(Number) (Street)

_____
(City) (State) (Zip)

3. Sex: (circle one) Male 1
Female 2

4. In what year were you born? _____
(Year)

5. Are you: (circle one)
White/Caucasian.....1
Black/Negro/Afro-American.....2
Oriental.....3
American Indian.....4
Mexican American.....5
Puerto-Rican American.....6
Other_____....7
(specify)

6. Where were you and your parents born? (circle one in each column)

	You	Your Father	Your Mother
USA	1	1	1
Canada	2	2	2
Central or S. America	3	3	3
Western Europe	4	4	4
Eastern Europe	5	5	5
Africa	6	6	6
Far East	7	7	7
Middle East	8	8	8

7. Your religion. (circle one in each column)

Religion	Religion in which you were reared	Present religious preference
Protestant	1	1
Roman Catholic	2	2
Jewish	3	3
Quaker	4	4
None	5	5
Other _____ (specify)	6	6

8. Your political orientation. (circle one)

Very conservative	1
Conservative	2
Moderate (middle of the road)	3
Liberal	4
Left	5
Far left	6
Other_____ (specify)	7

9. Marital Status. (circle one)

Single	1
Religious order	2
Married	3
Separated	4
Divorced	5
Widowed	6

10. Children

None	1
One	2
Two	3
Three	4
Four or more	5

Educational History

11. When did you receive your BA? _____ (year)

12. At what institution. _____ (Name)

_____ (Location)

13. What was your undergraduate major?_____
(Specify)

14. When did you begin your graduate study? _____ _____
(Month) (Year)

14A. If you received a Master's Degree prior to your doctorate indicate:

Year received_____
Field of specialization_____
Institution_____
(Name)
_____
(Location)

15. Doctoral degree granting institution._____
(Name)
_____
(Location)

16. What is your general field of history? (circle one)

American	1
European	2
English	3
Russian	4
Japanese	5
Indian	6
Other_____ (Specify)	7

17. What is your special emphasis within your field? (circle one)

Social	1
Political	2
Intellectual	3
Economic	4
Cultural	5
Agricultural	6
Other_____ (Specify)	7

18. Have you at any time interrupted your graduate study?

Yes	1
No	2

If No (go to 20)

19. Indicate the importance of each reason (if you have interrupted your studies more than once, check the reasons for the longest interruption).

	Major Reason	Minor Reason	No reason
Need to support family..	3	2	1
Need to assist spouse to complete grad.work..	3	2	1
Childbirth.....	3	2	1
Family and/or children requiring my attention at home.....	3	2	1
Desire to secure teaching experience before degree.....	3	2	1

19. Continued	Major Reason	Minor Reason	Not a Reason
Illness	3	2	1
Other _____ (specify)	3	2	1

20. What was your stipend source during graduate study? (mark each one)

Source	Major Source	Minor Source	Not a Source
Fellowship/scholarship	3	2	1
Teaching or res. assistantship	3	2	1
Loan	3	2	1
Personal savings	3	2	1
Support from spouse	3	2	1
Other_____ (specify)	3	2	1

Occupational History and Plans

21. Are you presently employed?

Yes	1
No	2

IF NO (go to 30)

22. Is your appointment in: (circle one)

Teaching	1
Academic Administration	2
Research	3
Other_____ (specify)	4

23. Is your employer a : (circle one)

Two-year college	1
Four-year, coeduc. college	2
Four-year women's college	3
Four-year men's college	4
Private University	5
State University	6
Other_____ (specify)	7

24. Indicate your rank or title:

Visiting lecturer or instructor	1
Lecturer	2
Instructor	3
Acting Assistant Prof.	4
Assistant Prof.	5
Associate Prof.	6
Full Prof.	7
Department Chairman	8
Other_____ (specify)	9

25. My salary before deductions is: (circle one)

less than 7,000	1
7,000 - 9,999	2
10,000 - 11,999	3
12,000 - 13,999	4
14,000 - 15,999	5
16,000 - 17,999	6
18,000 - 19,999	7
20,000 - or more	8

26. Is this salary based on : (circle one)

9/10 month appointment	1
11/12 month appointment	2

27. In accepting this job, indicate whether it was: (circle one)

The first and only offer	1
One of two or three firm offers	2
One of more than three firm offers	3
Other_____ (specify)	4

28. Are you employed at the institution at which you received your doctoral training?

Yes	1
No	2

28a. What source do you consider to have been the most effective aid to you in securing your first position

Dissertation supervisor	1
Departmental placement	2
University placement	3
Professional association	4
Other_____ (specify)	5

29. Indicate the importance of each reason in your decision to accept your present job offer (circle one in each column)

Reason	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important
Job scarcity (only offer).....	3	2	1
Salary.....	3	2	1
Prestige of institution	3	2	1
Prospects of promotion	3	2	1
Library facilities.....	3	2	1
Location of institution	3	2	1
Institution or employer willing to employ spouse.....	3	2	1
Could not relocate because of spouses employment.....	3	2	1

(GO TO 32)

30. IF NOT EMPLOYED I am not currently employed because. (circle one)

I did not receive an offer.....1
I received an offer but it was not commensurate with my ability or training.....2
I did not want to teach.....3
I was unable to find a suitably located college.....4
I have decided not to work this year because of family responsibilities.....5
I could not find domestic help.....6
I had to rest because of health reasons,.....7
I did not want to work.....8
Other_____ 9
(specify)

31. When do you plan to return to work? (circle one)

As soon as I find employment 1
Within the year 2
In a few years 3
Never again 4

32. Have you been employed before? Yes 1 No 2

33. IF YES, Indicate:
Dates: From_____ To_____
Title or position_____
Employer_____

34. From your experience and/or observation, what treatment was accorded to female students by your graduate department. (circle one in each row)

	Favored Strongly	Favored Somewhat	Neutral	Discriminate Somewhat	Discriminate Strongly
In gaining admission.	5	4	3	2	1
In gaining fellowship support .	5	4	3	2	1
In gaining opportunity to teach for self-support.	5	4	3	2	1
In securing employment aid from faculty and placement officers.	5	4	3	2	1
In securing faculty sponsor for dissertation.	5	4	3	2	1
In professional and scholarly contact with faculty.	5	4	3	2	1
In professional and scholarly contact with fellow students.	5	4	3	2	1
In other ways_____ _____ (specify)	5	4	3	2	1

35. From your experience and/or observation what treatment was accorded to:

	Favored Strongly	Favored Somewhat	Neutral	Discrim. Somewhat	Discrim. Strongly
Black students	5	4	3	2	1
Spanish speaking students	5	4	3	2	1
Students from lower socio-economic background	5	4	3	2	1
Students who participated in protests	5	4	3	2	1
Students who wore unconventual clothes and hair-styles	5	4	3	2	1
Students strongly committed to some organized religion	5	4	3	2	1
Foreign students	5	4	3	2	1

Appendix C

AHA Program participants:

			% of women in total
1939:	12 women participants	out of 182 total participants	6%
1949:	12 " "	" " 169 " "	7%
1959:	4 " "	" " 233 " "	1.7%
1969:	15 " "	" " 402 " "	3.7%

AHA Committee membership:

			% of women in total
1939:	11 women committee members	out of 117 total committee members	10.60%
1949:	3 " "	" " 68 " "	4.40%
1959:	5 " "	" " 118 " "	4.24%
1969:	6 " "	" " 162 " "	3.70%

Appendix D

Principal Sources Consulted

I. Books and Articles

Astin, Helen S., The Woman Doctorate in America; Origins, Career, and Family. Russell Sage Foundation; New York, 1969.

Bernard, Jessie Academic Women. Meridian: Cleveland and New York, 1966.

Epstein. Cynthia Woman's Place: Options and Limits in Professional Careers. Univ. of California Press, Berkeley, 1970.

Graham, Patricia Albjerg "Women in Academe." Science, Sept. 25, 1970.

Harris, Anne S. "The Second Sex in Academe." AAUP Bulletin, Sept., 1970.

Keniston, Ellen and Keniston, Kenneth "An American Anachronism: The Image of Women and Work." American Scholar, Vol. 33, No. 3, Summer, 1964.

Lifton, Robert J. (ed.) The Woman in America. Houghton Mifflin: Boston, 1965, for Daedalus.

Mooney, Joseph D., "Attrition among Ph.D. Candidates: An Analysis of a Cohort of Recent Woodrow Wilson Fellows," Journal of Human Resources, Vol. III, No. 1.

Rossi, Alice S., "The Status of Women in Graduate Departments of Sociology, 1968-1969," American Sociologist, Fall, 1969.

Scully Malcolm G., "Women in Higher Education: Challenging the Status Quo," from Chronicle of Higher Education, IV, 18, February 9 1970.

Shuck, Victoria "Women in Political Science: Some Preliminary Observations," Political Science, Fall, 1969.

Simon, Rita J.; Clark, Shirley Merritt and Galway, Kathleen "The Woman Ph.D.: A Recent Profile" Social Problems. Fall, 1967.

Perkins, Dexter and Snell, John, The Education of Historians in The United States. Mc Hill: New York,

II. Statistical Reports and Official Publications

Bayer, Alan E. College and University Faculty: A Statistical Description. A Report on a Collaborative Survey by the Carnegie Commission on the Future of Higher Education and the American Council of Education. ACE Research Report, Vol. 5, No. 5, June, 1970.

American Council of Education A Fact Book on Higher Education, Earned Degrees, No. 4, 1969.

U.S. Dept. of Health, Education and Welfare, in cooperation with the National Institutes of Health, Special Report on Women and Graduate Study. A Resources for Medical Research publication, June, 1958.

Chandler, Marjorie O. and Rice, Mabel C. — Earned Degrees Conferred, 1965-66. U.S. Dept. of Health, Education and Welfare, publication OE-54013-66. (Washington, 1966)

Chandler, Marjorie O. — Students Enrolled for Advanced Degrees. Fall, 1967. U.S. Dept. of Health, Education and Welfare Publication. (Washington, 1967)

U.S. Dept. of Labor; — Wage and Labor Standards Administration, Trends in Educational Attainment of Women. (Washington, 1969)

U.S. Dept. of Labor — Handbook of Women Workers. Bulletin 294. (Washington, 1969)

National Academy of Sciences — Doctorate Recipients from United States Universities 1959-1967. Publication 1489. (Washington, 1969)

National Academy of Sciences — Careers of Ph.D.'s, Academic versus Non-Academic; A Second Report on Follow-up of Doctorate Cohorts, 1935-1960. (This is Career Patterns Report No. 2 which the NIH commissioned the NAS to do). Publication 1577. (Washington, 1968)

III. Unpublished Studies

Berwald, Helen — "Attitudes toward Women College Teachers in Institutions of Higher Education Accredited by the North Central Association." Unpublished dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1962.

Mitchell, Susan Barber — "Women and the Doctorate: A Study of Enabling or Impeding Factors among Oklahoma's Doctoral Recipients in the Attainment and Use of the Degree." Unpublished dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1969.

Simpson, Lawrence A. — "A Study of Employing Agents' Attitudes toward Academic Women in Higher Education." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Pennsylvania State University, 1969.

IV. Institutional Reports

Report of the Committee on Senate Policy: Subcommittee on the Status of Academic Women at the University of California, Berkeley Division, 1970.

Siegel, Alberta E. and Carr, Ronald G. — "Education of Women at Stanford University," a part of The Study of Education at Stanford, Vol. II. March, 1969.

Women in the University of Chicago, the report of the Committee on University Women, May 1, 1970.

V. Unofficial Reports and Articles on Institutions

Alexander, Anne — "Who's Coma a Long Way, Baby?" The Johns Hopkins Magazine, April, 1970.

Bakke, E. Wight — "Graduate Education for Women at Yale," in Ventures, Fall, 1969.

Bynum, Caroline and Martin, Janet W. — "The Sad Status of Women at Harvard...." Radcliffe Quarterly, June, 1970.

Graduate Comment, — published at Wayne State University, Detroit. Vol. XII, No. 1, 1969, entire issue devoted to women in education. Here may be seen a summary article of Lawrence A. Simpson's unpublished dissertation cited in the first section of this short bibliography.

Preliminary Report on the Status of Women at Harvard, by the Women's Faculty Group. March 9, 1970.

Report from the Committee on Discrimination against Women Faculty, Columbia Women's Liberation, Women Faculty Group.

Yale Alumni Magazine, April, 1970, Devoted to "Coeducation and the New Woman."

42

Appendix E

Proportions of Women Receiving Ph.D. and M.A. Degrees between 1900 and 1970

(Trends in Educational Attainment of Women: U.S. Dept. of Labor)
Table 4, p. 15